CANUCK LAW
Reporting That You're Not Getting Elsewhere (Do Your Own Research To Verify)

SEPTEMBER 13, 2022 BY RONNIE

B.C. Supreme Court Throws Out 4 Cases Involving Vaccine Passports

the Courts of British Columbia
HOME
COURT OF APPEAL
SUPREME COURT
PROVINCIAL COURT
SEARCH JUDGMENTS
SITE SEARCH
FAQ
Prince Rupert
Photo by: Gary Linn
About the Supreme Court
Judgments
About Judgments
Recent Judgments
Search Judgments
Hearing Lists
Scheduling
home > supreme court > recent judgments
Print page
Email page
Recently Released Judgments
RSS
This webpage lists judgments recently released by the Supreme Court and provides links to copies of those judgments.
Posted Tuesday, September 13, 2022:
Dickin v. Windriver Power Corp., 2022 BCSC 1426 - 2022/08/18
B.C. v. D.E., 2022 BCSC 1597 - 2022/09/12
A.A. v. H.Q., 2022 BCSC 1599 - 2022/09/12
T.J.S. v. M.R.M.F., 2022 BCSC 1601 - 2022/09/12
Kassian v. British Columbia, 2022 BCSC 1603 - 2022/09/12
Eliason v. British Columbia (Attorney General), 2022 BCSC 1604 - 2022/09/12
Maddock v. British Columbia, 2022 BCSC 1605 - 2022/09/12

The British Columbia Supreme Court handed down 4 related rulings this week, each against freedom and bodily autonomy in the Province. All had to do with the so-called “vaccine passports” that were brought here in September 2021.

The decisions all came from Chief Justice Hinkson. The impression one can get is that there was little interest in preserving the rights of the petitioners. It’s pretty scary how the “trust the

experts" mantra can trump actual rights. There was apparently no real issue with limiting people's personal and social lives in order to coerce them into taking an unknown concoction.

The Vancouver Sun did a decent job of covering the rulings.

Kassian v. British Columbia, the Canadian Constitution Foundation was granted public interest standing. The petitioners were seeking exemptions to the vaccine passport system. However, the petitioners undercut their own arguments (paragraph 52), since they support the passes in general, but simply want proper exemptions to be built in. The Court said these proceedings were premature, as not all options had been exhausted.

Eliason v. British Columbia (Attorney General), was primarily aimed at the Food and Liquor Serving Premises Order" and "the Gatherings and Events Order. It was noted that the College of Physicians and Surgeons of B.C. gave guidelines to strictly limit exemptions. Ultimately, it was decided that there were other remedies available (such as seeking exemptions), and that going to Court shouldn't be the first option.

Maddock v. British Columbia, challenged the Food and Liquor Serving Premises (December 22, 2021), and the Gatherings and Events & Food and Liquor Serving Premises Orders. Apparently it wasn't enough to simply refuse a vaccine or not to be interested in it. The Judge decided that Bonnie Henry acted within her authority, and declined to vary the Orders.

Canadian Society for the Advancement of Science in Public Policy v. British Columbia, the court found that refusing to let people participate in "discretionary activities", and didn't violate human rights. Specifically, this referred to the Food and Liquor Serving Premises Order ("FLSP Order") and the Gathering and Events Order ("G&E Order"). Bonnie Henry, the unelected BCPHO, was within her rights making such orders. CSASPP was denied public interest standing, while its Executive Director, Kipling Warner, was granted private interest standing.

Do read the decisions above. The commentary provided doesn't really do justice, given how long the reasons are.

On the bright side, these petitioners at least got their day in court. Some constitutional rights lawyers struggle to form coherent sentences and arguments.

In each of these challenges, the Government tried to use “mootness” as a defense. In other words, it was argued that since the orders were expired, the judge should not consider them.

Interestingly, none of these cases involve challenges to the Public Health Act itself. It’s been covered here before many times how the 2005 Quarantine Act is really just domestic implementation of the 3rd Edition of the International Health Regulations. Also, the Public Health Agency of Canada, PHAC, is a de-facto branch of the World Health Organization. The W.H.O. Constitution is something else that erodes national sovereignty.

In fairness, these reviews are limited in scope. But it would be nice to have these issues brought up at least once. Unfortunately, the depth of this scam, including lack of proof a virus exists, seems off limits to most challengers.

(1) https://www.bccourts.ca/supreme_court/recent_judgments.aspx
(2) Kassian v. British Columbia, 2022 BCSC 1603
https://www.bccourts.ca/jdb-txt/sc/22/16/2022BCSC1603.htm
https://www.canlii.org/en/bc/bcsc/doc/2022/2022bcsc1603/2022bcsc1603.html
(3) Eliason v. British Columbia (Attorney General), 2022 BCSC 1604
https://www.bccourts.ca/jdb-txt/sc/22/16/2022BCSC1604.htm
https://www.canlii.org/en/bc/bcsc/doc/2022/2022bcsc1604/2022bcsc1604.html
(4) Maddock v. British Columbia, 2022 BCSC 1605
https://www.bccourts.ca/jdb-txt/sc/22/16/2022BCSC1605.htm
https://www.canlii.org/en/bc/bcsc/doc/2022/2022bcsc1605/2022bcsc1605.html
(5) CSASPP v. British Columbia, 2022 BCSC 1606
https://www.bccourts.ca/jdb-txt/sc/22/16/2022BCSC1606.htm
https://www.canlii.org/en/bc/bcsc/doc/2022/2022bcsc1606/2022bcsc1606.html
(6) https://vancouversun.com/news/local-news/bc-chief-judge-dismisses-four-challenges-to-covid-health-orders
(7) https://www.fluoridefreepeel.ca/fois-reveal-that-health-science-institutions-around-the-world-have-no-record-of-sars-cov-2-isolation-purification/

OLDER RULING
(A) Beaudoin v. British Columbia, 2021 BCSC 248, BCSC 248
https://www.bccourts.ca/jdb-txt/sc/21/02/2021BCSC0248.htm
https://www.canlii.org/en/bc/bcsc/doc/2021/2021bcsc512/2021bcsc512.html

CANADA, CANADIAN DECISIONS, GLOBALISM, HUMAN RIGHTS, UN/WHO, VACCINES

One Reply to “B.C. Supreme Court Throws Out 4 Cases Involving Vaccine Passports”

gracejoubarne461654805

SEPTEMBER 14, 2022 AT 5:15 AM

If people don’t get it yet that there is no Rule of Law and there are NO rights whatever, then there is nothing that can fix stupid. If we had rights, then we would not have to beg a Judge to let us exercise them.